SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 17 April, 1990

Tattooed Faces and Stilt Houses:

Who Were the Ancient Yue?

by
Heather Peters

Victor H. Mair, Editor
Sino-Platonic Papers
Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA
vmair@sas.upenn.edu
www.sino-platonic.org

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series edited by Victor H. Mair. The purpose of the series is to make available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor actively encourages younger, not yet well established, scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration. Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including Romanized Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM) and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is **not** the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

The only style-sheet we honor is that of consistency. Where possible, we prefer the usages of the *Journal of Asian Studies*. Sinographs (*hanzi*, also called tetragraphs [*fangkuaizi*]) and other unusual symbols should be kept to an absolute minimum. *Sino-Platonic Papers* emphasizes substance over form.

Submissions are regularly sent out to be refereed and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered. Manuscripts should be double-spaced with wide margins and submitted in duplicate. A set of "Instructions for Authors" may be obtained by contacting the editor.

Ideally, the final draft should be a neat, clear camera-ready copy with high black-and-white contrast.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations (including filling orders) may temporarily cease for up to two or three months at a time. In such circumstances, those who wish to purchase various issues of *SPP* are requested to wait patiently until he returns. If issues are urgently needed while the editor is away, they may be requested through Interlibrary Loan.

N.B.: Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* has been published electronically on the Web. Issues from no. 1 to no. 170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web at www.sino-platonic.org.

TATTOOED FACES AND STILT HOUSES: WHO WERE THE ANCIENT YUE?

Heather Peters, The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania

I. Introduction

Recent archeological evidence excavated at Hemudu, a site in northern Zhejiang Province south of Shanghai (Zhejiang Provincial Museum 1978), suggests that were we to step back in time to the 5th millennium B.C. in southern China, we would find people cultivating wet rice, raising water buffalo and living in houses perched high on stilt posts. Culturally, these people differed radically from the millet growing pit dwellers found in the Yellow River Valley region; their discovery has raised new and important questions regarding the development of culture and civilization in southern China.

At long last Chinese archeologists have begun to reinterpret the developments of early civilization in southern China. In so doing they have emphasized the emergence of a southern cultural complex which they call "Yue". The Yue culture, as defined by Chinese archeologists, spans both the Neolithic and early state period.

As more and more archeological data are retrieved from southern China, Chinese archeologists are asking the question, who were the people who created this Yue culture? Were they ethnically different from the people who lived in northern China? What language(s) did they speak? One favorite theory at the moment is that the Yue people were ancestral to the various Tai speaking populations, i.e. the Tai Lue, Tai Neu, Tong, Shui, Bu Yi and the Zhuang, living today primarily in southwestern China.

II. The Yue: Who? What?

What exactly does "Yue" mean? It can designate a culture, a people, or a state. When the word initially appeared in historical documents it referred to an Eastern Zhou state which emerged in northern Zhejiang province from the 7th to the 4th centuries B.C. (Zuo Zhuan: Xuan 8: 301 & 302). Shortlived, the Yue state nonetheless had substantial impact on the historical events of the time as chronicled in the Zuo Zhuan.

The people living in this state were called "men from Yue" and, from the historical literature, we perceive that the men from the northern Central Plains regarded these Yue as less civilized than themselves. For example, Sima Qian, author of the 1st century B.C. Shi Ji, noted disapprovingly that the Yue had short hair; they tatooed their bodies; clothed themselves with garments made from plant fibers; and lived in villages (Shi Ji "Yue Wang Gou Jian Shi Jia": 1739). In contrast, men from the Central Plains wore their hair long and bound it up "properly" with a hairpin; did not tattoo their bodies or faces; clothed themselves with luxurious fabrics made from silk; and preferred living in urban centers.

The concept of men from Yue, however, also incorporated a larger category of people than those who resided within the ancient Yue state. For example, the character used to write Yue is exactly the same as that used for the Viet in Vietnam. In modern Mandarin pronunciation, Vietnam is Yuenan, or the "Yue of the south". These men of Vietnam are just one group of people who figured into this broader notion of the Yue.

This wider perception of Yue also applied to the peoples broadly distributed throughout southern China during the Eastern Zhou period. For example, Sima Qian recorded that the Chu king Daowang (r. 328-298 B.C.) sent his minister Wu Qi south to pacify the "Bai Yue" (i.e. the Hundred Yue), clearly a reference to

troublesome groups living to the south of the Chu state centered in Hubei and northern Hunan (Shi Ji "Sunzi Wu Qi Lie Zhuan": 2168). The same incident is also recorded in the Hou Han Shu ("Nan Man Xinan Yi Lie Zhuan": 2831), a 4th century A.D. text, except that the term Nan Yue (Southern Yue) is substituted for Hundred Yue. Sima Qian also recorded that when the Chu king Wei (r. 339-328 B.C.) defeated Wu Jiang, King of Yue, the Yue people dispersed far and wide throughout the Jiangnan region (i.e. the region south of the Yangtze River) (Shi Ji, "Yue Wang Gou Jian Shi Jia": 1751). Some archeologists date the appearance of many Yue sub-groups first mentioned in Han texts, such as the Western Ou and Luo Yue, to this event and associate archeological remains excavated in southwestern China with them (Jiang Tingyu 1980; Jiang Tingyu and Wei Renyi 1978; Peng Hao 1984; Wu Mingsheng 1982, 1983a, 1983b; Zhang Chao 1984).

By the Han period (206 B.C.- A.D. 220) historical texts such as the Han Shu ("Dili Zhi": 1669) reported that the "Hundred Yue were dispersed for 7-8,000 li from Jiaozhi to Guai, with each group having their own surnames". This distribution covered an area in southern China which included the modern provinces of Zhejiang, Fujian and Guangdong in the east, extending through Jiangxi and Hunan to Guangxi, Guizhou and Yunnan in the west. What are we to make of this vast distribution - is it even meaningful to talk of a single ethnic group occupying this area? And, why do Chinese archeologists project the label "Hundred Yue" back onto the people living in this region during the prehistoric period?

III. Chinese Concept of Ethnicity

Part of the answer to these questions lies in how the Chinese perceive culture and ethnicity - both traditionally and today. The Chinese have long been interested in the problem of ethnicity, in part because of their conviction that Chinese

civilization and rule is somehow unique and distinctive. Historical materials and travelers' accounts from the Yuan, Ming and Qing periods (for example, Zhou Daguan's Zhenla Fengtu Ji [Records of the Customs of Cambodia, 1296-97], Qian Guxin's Bai Yi Zhuan [Chronicles of the Bai Yi Peoples, late 14th century A.D.], Wang Dayuan's Dao Yi Zhi Lue [Records of the Island Barbarians, mid 14th century], Ma Huan's Ying Yai Sheng Lan [Descriptions of the Coasts of Oceans, 1425-1432?], or Huang Shenzeng's Xi Yang Zhao Gong Dian Lu [Records of the Tributary Nations of the West, 1520]) reveal a deep fascination on the part of their Chinese authors with people different from themselves, people whose cultures reflected alternative choices to the "Chinese way".

In a broad sense, the Chinese approach to ethnicity is thus one of "us versus them". The "them" is defined in a cultural sense, i.e. people who did not share the Chinese language, dress, family structure, ritual system, etc. This contrast can also be expressed in terms of nei (inside) and wai (outside). In the view of the classical Zhou people (ca. 1100-221 B.C.), the world consisted of nine concentric circles surrounding a central zone known as the king's domain (Zhou li, from Cushman 1970: 20-30). According to this schema, the six zones closest to the king's domain were considered "nei fu", i.e. inside and hence part of "Zhongguo" (the central state). The three outer circles were "wai fu", i.e. outside. They did not belong to the Chinese world and were inhabited by "barbarians".

The Er Ya (Han period -- 206 B.C. - A.D. 220) offered a second, more complex view of the world. In this view the Chinese world is surrounded by four seas of barbarians -- each sea or group is associated with one of the four directions: the northern di, the eastern yi, the southern man, and the western rong. Each of the respective seas can be further divided into nei and wai. The nei groups can be even further subdivided into sheng (raw), i.e. uncivilized and hence potentially

dangerous, and shu (熟 cooked or ripe), i.e. civilized in the sense that they have been "tamed" by the influence of Chinese civilization (summarized in Cushman 1970: 25).

As the early Chinese state expanded its boundaries and brought greater numbers of non-Chinese groups into its political sphere, Chinese bureaucrat-officials became even more concerned with identifying and classifying non-Chinese groups in order better to rule and control them. This practical application of the ethnographic descriptions found in the historical materials is further emphasized in the later Ming (1368-1644) and Qing periods (1644-1911) when some of the information was incorporated into actual handbooks designed for the officials who administered in the frontier regions peopled by mostly non-Han groups (Cushman 1970: 31).

In theory, the definition of ethnicity applied by modern 20th century Chinese ethnographers and archeologists stems from 19th-century European evolutionary models. It was transmitted to China via Stalin whose view derived from the 19th-century thinking of Marx and Engels. However, as Mosely points out (1966: 15) "there was a high degree of compatibility between the traditional Chinese attitude toward China`s non-Han peoples and the Marxist-Leninist theory on the national question. For "non-Han" could be substituted "feudal" or "prefeudal," while for "Han" could be substituted "capitalist" or "modern."

Yet, regardless of the similarity of attitudes, the Marxist-Leninist view of nationalites does differ from the traditional in several ways. Ethnicity, or the question of nationalities, in Marxist-Leninist theory, is an important political issue. According to the Marxist view, the modern nation (each peopled by a dominant nationality) forms during the capitalist stage, the nation is fully realized during the socialist stage, and withers away during the communist stage (Hsieh Jiann 1986: 4). In the course of political evolution, nations must form in order for them to wither.

Hence, the Soviet socialist system encouraged the formation of socialist republics consisting of nationalities linked under that broader political umbrella of the Soviet Union of Socialist Republics.

As part of the program for resolving the "nationalities question" in newly socialist China, party policy required loyal cadres to go out and do revolutionary work among the nationalities in order to raise their class consciousness. To carry out this policy, cadres faced two initial tasks. The first was to identify who in fact were the nationalities. The second was to classify their level of political development so that the correct political education could be applied (Mosely 1966: 18). The party recognized that it was essential to dispel the struggles among the nationalities that characterized the past. The nationalities must then be united in the universal struggle against the imperialist feudal and capitalistic oppressors.

After the new Chinese socialist government acknowledged the importance of identifying nationalities, the next question was how to accomplish this task? In 1950 the Chinese Communist Party held a congress in order to discuss the criteria for identifying nationalities (or ethnic groups). Fei Xiaotong and Yang Kun were the only anthropologists to attend the meeting; the rest were party bureaucrats. Despite disagreement voiced by Fei and Yang, the Congress voted to adopt the criteria proposed by Stalin for identifying nationalities. A nation, he said, is "a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of common language, territory, economic life, and psychological makeup manifested in a common culture." (J. Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, London: Wishart, 1947, p.8, quoted in Moseley 1966: 34, fn.3). As the Chinese Communist Party saw it, these criteria could be restated so that each distinct ethnic group must demonstrate:

1. a common language,
2. a common residency (i.e. territory),
3. common cultural traditions and customs,
4. common religious traditions.

Essentially then, an ethnic group was perceived as a recognizable, bounded group with shared language, territory and cultural traits distinguishable from other groups. As stated above, this "one language -- one people -- one culture" approach corresponds to that of late 19th - early 20th century anthropologists and ethnographers. Using these criteria, Chinese anthropologists proceeded to analyze rigorously the various peoples who claimed status as ethnic groups to determine whether or not they indeed constituted distinct nationalities.

IV. The Yue Archeologically Speaking

What bearing does this concept of ethnicity have on archeology? It will play a role in how the archeologist defines and classifies prehistoric and early historic cultures.

We may now ask ourselves just how do Chinese archeologists justify collapsing the large geographical area outlined in section II into one Yue mega-culture? We must begin the answer to this question by first providing a broad definition of culture. Essentially culture "is the abstract values, beliefs and perceptions of the world that lie behind people's behavior, and which that behavior reflects. These are shared by members of a society, and when acted upon they produce behavior considered acceptable within that society. Cultures are learned, through the medium of language, rather than inherited biologically...." (Haviland 1983: 29). An important corollary to this definition is that we cannot assume cultures and ethnic groups are equivalent.

Although archeologists may share this definition of culture, their work is complicated by the fact that they study the cultures of past peoples whose behavior can no longer be observed and analyzed. Archeologists, therefore, define their cultural groups by classifying the artifacts left behind by past peoples. The archeologist assumes that these artifacts reflect the values and beliefs of the people who created them. Sites yielding similar artifacts are presumed to reflect shared values and beliefs and can thus be classified as belonging to the same culture, albeit an "archeological culture".

Using this approach, we can see that the size of an archeological culture can be manipulated by the archeologist's assessment of what constitutes significant, or diagnostic, features for defining a culture. Certain archeologists have been classified as "lumpers". They require fewer diagnostic criteria to define their groups which results in fewer but larger archeological cultures. Others are "splitters" who define cultures using more diagnostic traits. Their approach leads to smaller but greater numbers of archeological groups. When it comes to defining the Yue culture, Chinese archeologists are clearly "lumpers".

Another important factor which affects the archeological definition of culture is the nature of what is or is not preserved in the archeological record. Often the kinds of artifacts used to distinguish cultures are very limited, and therefore misleading. In the hotter and more humid regions of south China, for example, organic materials such as textiles, baskets, wood materials, are less well preserved than in cooler, drier climates.

Within the past twenty years western archeologists have made great strides in obtaining and analyzing other kinds of data such as settlement patterns which can provide better information on behavior (for ex. see Binford and Binford 1968, K.C. Chang 1968, Hodder, Isaac & Hammond 1981), yet, the tendency is still for

archeologists to focus their analysis on pottery, stone and metal artifacts. Consequently, due to the limitations of their materials, the cultures delineated by archeologists probably do not correspond to actual culture groups alive at any given time.

We can now understand that Chinese archeologists classify most of China south of the Yangtze river as belonging to one cultural tradition because the sites excavated there exhibit a broad similarity of artifact types. For the Neolithic period, from ca. the 5th to the 2nd millennium B.C., archeologists report finding a widespread distribution of stamped geometric pottery, shouldered stone axes and stepped adzes (Li Kunsheng 1983; Rong Guanqiong 1956; Guangdong Provincial Museum 1959; Fujian Cultural Committee 1961; Mou Yongkang 1981; Lin Huixiang 1954; Wu Mingsheng 1982, 1983a, 1983b; Peng Hao 1984; Shang Chao 1984; Yan Yaolin & Xu Huanglin 1985; Zhang Zeng Qi 1982). These site reports come from Zhejiang, Fujian, Jiangxi, Hunan, Guangdong, Guangxi, Yunnan, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. Stamped, geometric potsherds, similar to ones found in Guangdong, Jiangxi and Fujian, are reported even from the Xishuangbanna region of southern Yunnan Province (Daizu Jian Shi, editorial committee, 1985: 32-33; Jiang Yingliang 1983: 21). Only one site, Hemudu, the northern Zhejiang site mentioned above (Zhejiang Provincial Museum 1978) provided more substantial data about settlement patterns, domestication of plants and animals, and some bone and wooden implements. Ironically, the Hemudu site did not yield geometric pottery or shouldered adzes.

During the early historic period (the 2nd - 1st millennium B.C., called the Bronze Age by Chinese archeologists), which corresponds to the period of early state formation in northern China, archeologists report finding a distribution of sites within the same region which contain hard, proto-stoneware, stamped geometric pottery, glazed pottery, together with boot-shaped bronze axes and trapezoid-shaped

bronze axes, and sometimes a unique basin-shaped ding tripod with tall, spindly legs (Feng Yuhui 1984; Fu Juyou 1982; Gao Zhixi 1980; Jin Zegong 1984; KG 1973.1; KG 1979.6; Mo Zhi and Li Shiwen 1963; Mo Zhi 1963; Mou Yongkang 1984; Peng Hao 1984; Tan Guangrong 1984; Wenwu Cultural Committee 1979: 325-330; Wu Mingsheng 1982, 1983a; Yang Hao 1961; Yang Yaolin and Xu Huanglin 1985).

In an archeological sense, it is legitimate to classify this region as a single cultural tradition with broadly shared characteristics. To designate this cultural area specifically as Yue, however, has farther-reaching implications.

Why did Chinese archeologists select the term Yue to name this mega-culture spanning a time depth of more than 5,000 years? As we saw above, the term Yue is drawn from historical texts dating to the Eastern Zhou and Han periods where it is used not only for the Yue state and its inhabitants, but also more generally for non-Han groups living in southern China during the early historical period. By extending the label Yue to include both the historic and prehistoric peoples and cultures, Chinese scholars are assuming a genetic connection between the historically defined Yue groups cited in the texts, and the peoples which preceded them in the archeological record. In this regard they are using a method similar to Julian Steward's "direct historical approach" (Steward 1942). This is a recognized and legitimate approach, the main difference being that Steward began with living ethnic groups whose history was then pushed backwards in time using historical materials to that point where it overlapped with prehistory.

V. A Closer Look at Ethnicity

There are several problems with the reasoning of the Chinese archeologists. First, they are confusing archeological cultures with ethnicity. They have taken a historical term which implies ethnicity and have applied it to what is basically an

archeologically defined cultural tradition. This large archeological mega-culture undoubtedly masks a sizable number of ethnic groups. Second, we do not even know for certain whether the various types of historical Yue described in the texts were, anthropologically speaking, sub-divisions within one ethnic group.

Third, the Chinese approach to ethnicity, i.e. the one language -- one culture -- one people concept is fundamentally problematic. Widespread similar, or shared, cultural traits need not necessarily mark ethnicity and can easily mask a plethora of diverse ethnic groups and cultures. Some overlapping traits may simply express an ecological response to a shared environment. For example, the Tai, the Akha and the Yao are ethnically distinct groups living side by side in southern Yunnan and northern Thailand, but all live in raised or stilt houses.

Recent work on the concept of ethnicity by western anthropologists further challenges the conventional conception that ethnic groups are bounded units of people who share a common culture, speak a common language and belong to a common society (Keyes 1979: 3). Ethnicity is viewed as having no existence apart from interethnic relations (Cohen 1978: 389), meaning that people constantly define themselves in relationship to other groups. F.K. Lehman (1967: 105) has pointed out, "social and cultural systems are reference systems, that is, cognitive models at varying levels of awareness." He further suggests that "when people identify themselves as members of some ethnic category... they are taking positions in culturally defined systems of inter-group relations" (Lehman 1967: 106).

Thus, it has become apparent that people can sustain parallel but separate ethnic identities within one social setting and that they can select the appropriate identity depending on the situation. For example, are Chinese living in Thailand Thai or Chinese? Many individuals easily assume both identities, identifying with Chinese society in one context and Thai in another. Charles Keyes (1979: 4) also calls our

attention to villagers in northeastern Thailand with whom he carried out research. He points out that some of the villagers in this area maintain a "Lao" identity when talking with officials from central Thailand, a "Thai" identity when they visit friends in present-day Laos, and even an Isan (a term referring to the northeast region of Thailand) identity when they wish to express identification with the particular local culture which has developed in that region over the years.

What do these new approaches to ethnicity mean for the archaeologist? First, we now recognize that ethnicity is far more complex than previously assumed. In doing so, we must again re-emphasize the limitations imposed on the archeologist by the nature of his data. This recent work on the nature of ethnicity has evolved from research carried out on living groups, and the degree of subtlety and sophistication the analysis achieves is lost in the archeological record. Consequently, this new theoretical work serves as a strong warning to archeologists to treat our own use of the word "ethnic group" with care, and as a reminder that the archeologically defined "culture group" is a heuristic device created by the archeologist. It should not be equated with an "ethnic group".

VI. Perceived Links Between the Ancient Yue and Today's Tai

Unaware of these problems, recent articles both reporting and discussing the new sites associated with the Bronze Age Yue culture in southern China have linked this early culture with today's Tai speaking ethnic groups (Feng Yuhui 1984; Fu Juyou 1982; Huang Huikun 1986; Jiang Tingyu 1980, 1982; Jiang Yingliang 1980, 1983; Li Kanfen 1985; Li Kunsheng 1983; Research Committee for the Bai Yue Ethnic Group 1985). This association of the ancient Yue with the Tai is not a new idea. Jiang Yingliang, one of China's formost scholars on Tai culture and history, argued for this connection as early as the 1950's (Jiang Yingliang 1950).

What is it that prompts Chinese archeologists and ethnologists to forge a direct historical connection between the ancient Yue and the modern Tai? Using the criteria outlined by Stalin for defining an ethnic group, they make a comparative analysis between the archaeologically defined Yue culture and the modern Tai cultures.

First, they posit a common language for both the ancient Yue and the Tai. Unfortunately, the analysis of this issue is far from satisfactory. Spoken languages leave no trace in the archeological record, and most of the artifacts from Yue sites do not contain examples of written language. The exceptions are artifacts from the Yue state where inscriptions are found on bronze vessels and weapons. Unfortunately, the inscriptions are written using Chinese characters, making it difficult to assess a precise pronunciation of the ancient Yue language, if it is in fact ancient Yue written on the bronzes.

Some distorted evidence of the pronunciation of the ancient Yue language does appear in a few Han period texts. For example, Liu Xiang's 劉向說苑 Shuo Yuan uses Chinese characters to record examples of Yue vocabulary as well as some Yue folk songs in Yue. The characters are used not ideographically, but phonetically. Jiang Yingliang (1983: 5) feels that of the fifty-four characters in one song, more than ten are precisely the same as words found in the Zhuang language today. Jiang (1983: 76) further calls our attention to Yang Xiong's 揚雄方言 Fang Yan which also recorded the pronunciation of different Wu-Yue words, transliterating them using Chinese characters. For example:

da (大 in Chinese meaning "big" or "large") -- the Jing, Wu Yang and Ou say zhuo 濯

xin (信 in Chinese meaning "true" or "to believe") -- the Western Ou say mu 穆

fu (輔 in Chinese meaning "to assist" or "complement") - the Wu and Yue say xu 胥

shou (受 in Chinese meaning "receive" or "accept") -- the Yang Yue say na 龕

si (死 in Chinese meaning "death") -- the Yue people call death zha 劄

According to Jiang's linguistic analysis, many of these words are Proto-Tai (1983: 77-80). Jiang's analysis, however, only uses Chinese characters to indicate these old Wu-Yue words. Without a reconstruction of the pronunciation of Han period Chinese which should be compared with reconstructed Proto-Tai, the analysis is meaningless.

Other linguists (Norman and Mei 1976) have argued for the presence of Austroasiatic speakers along the shores of the middle Yangtze and parts of the southeast coast during the first millenium B.C. Although Norman and Mei's definition of Austroasiatic is somewhat controversial (it includes Austronesian languages as well), they are, in fact, suggesting the presence of several non-Chinese language groups, not simply Proto-Tai -- a far more complex and more realistic scenario.

In addition, in their zeal to link the Hundred Yue with Proto-Tai, Chinese scholars have ignored another school of scholarship (Chamberlain 1972, 1975; Gedney 1965; Mote 1964; Terweil 1978; Wyatt 1982) which places the Proto-Tai homeland in the Tonkin region of the northern Vietnam - Laos border area, not in the region just south of the Yangtze. This conclusion is reached because of the great diversity of dialects around the eastern Guangxi-North Vietnam border as compared to the homogeneity of dialects further west in Thailand, Burma and Laos (Gedney 1965: 112). According to this model, the Tai speakers found today in Guangxi and Yunnan would represent later northwestern migrations, not southwestern. Thus,

there would not have been Proto-Tai speakers present in all the areas associated with the Neolithic and Bronze Age Yue cultures. Furthermore, these linguists estimate the age of Proto-Tai at not older than 2000 years (Gedney unpublished; Chamberlain 1975) making it impossible to link the neolithic Yue with Proto-Tai speakers.

As for the criteria of a common territory, Jiang (1950, 1983) and others simply assign the Yue homeland to southern China. The modern Tai speakers still live dispersed in this region today, and although they have been displaced in many areas by Han Chinese, this area is assumed to illustrate the concept of a common residency. As seen above, this southern Chinese homeland is not agreed upon by all. The linguistic evidence strongly points to Tonkin region in northern Vietnam as the nuclear area of Proto-Tai. In addition, as Chamberlain (1975: 60) notes, "one of the gaps in Southeast Asian history has been the failure of scholars to research thoroughly the many indigenous histories of the Tai groups. Instead, the tendency has been to lean heavily on the Chinese records...." Histories and historical legends associated with such groups such as the Tai Lue, the Black Tai and the Lao suggest a westward migration and not a southern, for example, the legend of the golden deer, popular among the Tai Lue of the Sipsong Panna (part of which falls within today's Xishuangbanna Dai Autonomous Province). According to the story, Phya Wulu, ruler of the Tai, shot and wounded a golden deer while hunting. The deer led him on a long chase over mountains and valleys, finally arriving in the region of today's Xishuangbanna. Because the region was beautiful and fertile, he brought his people there to settle and prosper. In some versions, Pya Wulu was the ruler of Meung Lao, today's Laos (Jiang 1983: 150 - 151). Thus, it is not certain that the distribution of Bronze Age Yue culture, which broadly corresponds with the distribution of today's Tai populations living in China, correlates with the earliest centers of Tai culture.

The strongest connections between the ancient Yue and the modern Tai groups, however, argues Jiang and others, lies in the series of culture traits seen as diagnostic of both. For example, both the ancient Yue and the modern Tai practice the custom of tattooing the body. There is abundant evidence in early historical texts documenting the presence of this practice. For example, in the Zhuangzi it says: "a man of Sung who sold ceremonial hats made a trip to Yueh, but the Yueh people cut their hair short and tattoo their bodies and had no use for such things..." (from The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu, translated by B. Watson 1968: 34). Sima Qian recorded that "Gou Jian, the king of Yue, was the descendant of Yu and the grandson of Shao Kang of the Xia. He was enfeofed at Guiji and made his ancestral sacrifices to Yu. (The Yue) tattooed their bodies and cut their hair short..." (Shi Ji: 1739).

Some possible archeological confirmation of this custom is gleaned from mortuary items excavated from tombs belonging to the elite of the Eastern Zhou period state of Chu centered in Hubei and Hunan. Chu tombs frequently included clothed or painted male and female wooden figurines. A few of these figurines had faces marked with dots which may represent tattooing. Because the Chu state incorporated the Yue region during the late Zhanguo period (476-221 B.C.), these figures may represent members of the Yue population (Peters 1983).

It is true that tattooing is still a common custom among many Tai speaking groups today. Both Tai Neu (from the Dehong Autonomous Region in Yunnan) and Tai Lue males, for example, might cover their bodies from the chest down to their thighs, including their backs, with elaborate tattoos. These tattoos serve as a marker of the individual's transition to adult malehood. In addition to being considered decorative, certain kinds are believed to protect the individual from bodily harm during warfare or other dangerous situations. The tattoos consist of passages from Buddhist sutras, magic spells, as well as certain protective symbols

such as nagas (serpent spirits). A fourteenth century Chinese text reported that untattooed Tai males in the Dehong-Shan States region were not only treated with mockery by other people in their village, but that they were also compared with females (see Qian Guxun's Bai Yi Zhuan, p.90).

However, we should point out that Tai speakers are not the only people to practice tattooing -- for example, the Dulong, a Tibeto-Burman speaking group living today in northwestern Yunnan, and the Nagas, another Tibeto-Burman speaking group found today in northwest India. The practice was also widespread among Malayo-Polynesian speakers -- the Maori of New Zealand being a noteworthy example as well as the Ainu of Hokkaido. Furthermore, Terweil (1978: 244) points out, one simply cannot take the practice of tattooing itself as significant. Deeper analysis must be made as to the kind of tattooing, for example, where it is placed on the body and whether it is restricted to men or to women.

Attention has also been given to the pile dwellings (houses built on stilts) associated with both the ancient Yue and modern Tai speakers today. Some later textual evidence for this house type is found in Zhang Hua's 張華 博物志 Bo Wu Zhi (a Six Dynasties text) which recorded the Southern Yue as living in "nests", i.e. houses raised in the air. The author of the 淮南子 Huai Nanzi (Western Han) also noted that the ancient Yue did not live in walled houses; they lived in houses shaped like birds' nests.

There is some archeological evidence for stilt houses in southern China. For example, the people who lived at Hemudu nearly 7,000 years ago lived in raised houses. More significant for Chinese archeologists, however, are the raised houses depicted on the bronze drums excavated from the late Eastern Zhou - early Western Han period site of Shizhai Shan (Wen Wu Press 1959). Some Yunnan archeologists

call this archeological culture the Dian Yue culture (Li Kunsheng 1983; Jiang Yingliang 1983) and link it with modern Tai speakers in Yunnan today.

However, as argued above, raised dwellings appear to be a response to specific environmental conditions and are constructed by many different ethnic groups living in southwestern China, Southeast Asia, and Polynesia today. As a trait, they serve better to distinguish northern Han Chinese houses from Southeast Asian. It is well known that in traditional Southeast Asian villages today, Chinese merchants usually live in ground level houses, often made of poured concrete, whereas the local people prefer raised houses constructed from wood and bamboo.

Another cultural trait frequently cited as diagnostic of both Yue and Tai culture is skill in metallurgy, especially illustrated in the production of bronze, mushroom-shaped drums. Ethnographically, however, these drums are associated today with not only Tai speakers, but Miao (Miao-Yao, a branch of Sino-Tibetan), Karens (a branch of Sino-Tibetan) and others. The distribution of these drums is very wide - they are found in Yunnan, Guizhou, Guangxi, Guangdong, Vietnam, northern Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia and even out into the Malayo-Ponesian archipelago (Smith and Watson 1979, Appendix: 495-507). Historically, the drums span the mid-first millennium B.C. up to the 14th century A.D. As a marker of Tai ethnicity, they are, at best, problematic.

Finally, Jiang and Li suggest characteristics such as wet rice agriculture and a highly developed water technology (a common saying among Chinese is that Tai love water and build their villages along river banks). This statement is so generalized as to be practically meaningless.

In the end, when we review the nature of the suggested Tai cultural characteristics which are supposed to link them with the Hundred Yue, it would appear that they serve more as markers distinguishing Southeast Asian cultures

from Han Chinese, and more specifically, lowland Southeast Asian cultures -- cultures which would include not only Tai speaking groups, but Mon and Austronesian speakers as well.

VII. Conclusions

In conclusion, the attempt to link the archeologically defined "Yue culture" which occupied southern China during the Neolithic through Han periods with the Tai-speaking groups currently living in southwestern China today is far from conclusive. First, it is questionable whether or not we can assume that the Yue people cited in the historical sources are in fact one ethnic group. Second, the methodology applied by Chinese archeologists and ethnographers to this issue raises many problems. For example, the arguments they use imply that ethnicity is a bounded, defined unit which can be identified through recognizable criteria. As noted above, current thinking on the concept of ethnicity rejects this notion. To reiterate, ethnicity is better understood as consisting of fluid categories where membership in one group is not mutually exclusive with membership in others.

Third, during the twelfth to fourteenth century A.D., historical sources, both Chinese and Tai, clearly establish the existence of Theravada Buddhist, Tai speaking states in the region of today's Xishuangbanna, Dehong, the Shan states in Burma, northern Thailand and northern Laos with characteristically Tai political, social and cultural systems. It is not so clear, however, that these groups had their origin in the Yangtze region and spread south. The theory currently supported by linguists locates the earliest Proto-Tai speaking groups about 2000 years ago in the Tonkin Valley region on the border of north Vietnam and Laos.

Finally, the various cultural traits cited by archeologists as ones linking the ancient Yue with the Tai are better understood as markers of a broad Southeast

Asian culture area which can be contrasted with the Han or Sinitic cultures based in northern China.

This article is an expanded version of a paper read at the 39th Annual Meeting for the Association for Asian Studies, April, 1987.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

JHKG	Jianghan Kaogu	江汉考古
KG	Kaogu	考古
KGXB	Kaogu Xuebao	考古学报
W W	Wenwu	文物

I. Primary Sources

Han Shu (Book of Han) 漢書
Compiled by Ban Gu (ca 82 A.D.) 班固
Zhonghua Shuju Edition, 1975
Beijing: Xinhua Shudian.

Hou Han Shu (Book of the Later Han) 後漢書
Compiled by Fan Ye (398-445 A.D.). 范曄
Zhonghua Shuju Edition, 1973.
Beijing: Xinhua Shudian.

Shi Ji (Records of the Historian) 史記
Compiled by Sima Qian (145-86? B.C.) 司馬遷
Zhonghua Shuju Edition, 1972.
Beijing: Xinhua Shudian.

Zuo Zhuan (Mr. Zuo's Commentary to the Chunqiu) 左傳
Compilation attributed to Zuo Qiuming during the Chunqiu period. Probably compiled about 300 B.C. 左 秋明
1872 The Chinese Classics. Vol. V, Pt. 1 and 2,
contains text and translation by James Legge.
2nd Edition. Reprint from last editions of the Oxford University Press.

II. Secondary Sources

Binford, Sally and Lewis, eds.
1968 New Perspectives in Archaeology.
Chicago: Aldine Press.

Chamberlain, James R.
1972 The Origin of the Southwestern Tai.
Bulletin des Amis du Royaume Lao 7/8: 233-44.

1975 A New Look at the History and Classification of the Tai Languages.
In Studies in Tai Linguistics in Honor of William J. Gedney, ed. by Jimmy Harris & James Chamberlain.
Bangkok: Central Institute of English Language.
Pp. 49-66.

Chang, Kwang-chih
1968 Settlement Archaeology.
Palo-Alto, California: National Press Books.

Cohen, Ronald
1978 Ethnicity: Problem and Focus In Anthropology.
Annual Review of Anthropology 7: 379-403.

Cushman, Richard
1970 Rebel Haunts and Lotus Huts: Towards an Ethnohistory of the Guanghsi Yao.
Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.
University Microfilm Reprint.

Daizu Jian Shi, ed.
1985 Daizu Jian Shi. 傣族簡史
Kunming: Yunnan Renmin Press.

Feng Yuhui 馮玉輝
1984 Heng yang Shi Miaopu, Wuma Guicao, Maoping Gu Mu Fajue Jianbao.
衡阳市苗圃五馬归槽茅坪古墓发掘简报
KG 10: 800-886.

Fu Juyou 付举有
1982 Zixing Jiu Shi Chunqiu Mu.
资兴旧市春秋墓
Hunan Kaogu Jikan 1: 25-31.

Fujian Cultural Committee
1961 Min Bei Jian Ou he Jian Yang Xin Shi Qi Shidai Yizhi.
闽北建瓯和建阳新石器时代遗址
KG 4: 185-192.

Gao Zhixi 高至喜
1980 Hunan Faxian di Jijian Yuezu Fengge di Wenwu.
湖南发现的几件越族风格的文物
WW 12: 48-51.

Gedney, William J.
1965 Review of Brown in The Social Science Review
3.2: 107-112.

Guangdong Provincial Museum
1959 Guangdong Nanhai Xian Xi Qiao Shan Chutu di Shiqi.
广东南海县西樵山出土的石器
KGXB 4: 1-17.

Haviland,William A.
1983 Cultural Anthropology.
New York: Holt, Rinehart Winston.
4th Edition.

Hodder, Ian, Glynn Isaac and Norman Hammond, eds.
1981 Pattern of the Past.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huang Huikun
1986 A Research on Ancient "Siam-Dai" Kingdoms.
Paper presented at The Conference on "Lan Na and Sipsong Panna: Studies in Cultural Relation, Continuity and Change."
Chiangmai, Thailand. August 1987.

Hsieh, Jiann
1986 "China's Nationalities Policy: Its Development and Problems".
Anthropos 81.1/3: 1-20.

Jiang Tingyu 蒋廷瑜
1980 Cong Yinshanling Zhanguo Mu Kan Xi Ou.
从银山岭战国墓看西瓯
KG 2: 170-178.

1982 Chu Guo di Nanjie he Chu Wenhua dui Lingnan di Yinbgxiang.
楚国的南界和楚文化对岭南的影响
Zhongguo Kaogu Xue Hui, Di Er Ci Nian Hui Lunwen Ji
中国考古学会第二次年会论文集
Beijing: Wen Wu Press. Pp. 67-73.

Jiang Tingyu and Wei Renyi 蒋廷瑜 韦仁义
1978 Pingle Yinshanling Zhanguo Mu.
平乐银山岭战国墓
KGXB 2: 211-158.

Jiang Yingliang 江应梁
1950 Baiyi di Shenghuo Wenhua.
Shanghai: Zhonghua Co.
百夷的生活文化
1980 Bai Yue Zu Shu Yanjiu.
百越族属研究
Xinan Min Zu Yan Jiu Ji Kan 1: 39-58.
西南民族研究集刊
1983 Daizu Shi. 傣族史
Sichuan Minzu Press.

Jin Zegong 金则恭
1984 Changsha Xian Chutu Chunqiu Shiqi Yuezu Qingtong Qi.
长沙县出土春秋时期越族青铜器
Hunan Kaogu Jikan 2: 35-37.

Kaogu
1973 Guangxi Gong Cheng Xian Chutu di Qingtong Qi.
广西荣城县出土的青铜器
KG 1: 30-34, 41.

1979 Fujian Zhenghe Xian Faxian Chunqiu Shiqui di Qingtong Bingqi he Yinwen Taoqi.
福建政和县发现春秋时期的青铜兵器和印纹陶器
KG 6: 565

Keyes, Charles
1979 Introduction.
In Ethnic Adaptation and Identity.
Philadelphia: ISHI Press.

Lehman, F.K.
1967 Ethnic Categories in Burma and the theory of Social Systems.
In Southeast Asian Tribes, Minorities and Nations, edited by Peter Kunstadter.
Vol. I: 93-124.

Li Kanfen 李干芬
1985 Lun Bai Yue Minzu yu Zhuang Tong Yu Zu Zhu Minzu di Guangxi.
论百越民族与壮侗语族诸民族的关系
Yanjiu Ji Kan 6: 33-41.
研究集刊
Li Kunsheng 李昆声
1983 Bai Yue Wenhua zai Yunnan di Kaogu Faxian.
百越文化在云南的考古发现

民族学报
Minzu Xue Bao 3: 399-409.

Lin Huixiang 林惠祥
1954 Fujian Nanbu di Xin Shiqi Shidai Yizhi.
福建南部的新石器时代遗址
KGXB 8: 1-17.

Mo Zhi 莫稚
1963 Guangdong Shixing Baishiping Shan Zhanguo Yizhi.
广东始兴白石坪山战国遗址
KG 4: 217-220.

Mo Zhi and Li Shiwen 莫稚 李始文
1963 Guangdong Zengcheng, Shixing Shan Zhanguo Yizhi.
广东增城，始兴的战国遗址.
KG 3: 143-151, 160.

Moseley, George
1966 The Party and the National Question in China.
Cambridge,MA: MIT Press.

Mote, Frederick
1964 "Problems of Thai Prehistory."
The Social Review 2.2: 100-109.

Mou Yongkang 牟永抗
1984 Shaoxing 306 Hao Zhanguo Mu Fajue Jianbao.
绍兴306号战国墓发掘简报
WW 1: 10-26.

Norman, Jerry and Mei Tzu-lin
1976 The Austroasiatics in Ancient South China.
Monumenta Serica 32: 274-301.

Peng Hao 彭浩
1984 Wo Guo Liang Zhou di Yue Shi Ding.
我国两周的越式鼎
Hunan Kaogu Jikan 2: 136-141,119.

Peters, Heather A.
1983 The Role of the State of Chu in Eastern Zhou Period China: A Study of Interaction and Exchange in the South.
Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale Univesity.
Currently under review for publication.

Qian Guxun 钱古训
1980 Bai Yi Zhuan. 百夷传
14th century text annotated by Jiang Yingliang.
Kunming: Yunnan Renmin Press.

Research Committee for the Bai Yue Ethnic Group
1985 Bai Yue Minzu Shi Lun Cong. 百越民族史论丛
Guangxi Renmin Press.

Rong Guanqiong 容观琼
1956 Guangxi Zuoyou Jiang Yu Xin Shiqi Shidai Yizhi Jian Jie.
广西左右江域新石器时代遗址简介
Wenwu Can Kao Ciliao 6.

Smith, R.B. and William Watson, eds.
1979 Early South East Asia.
New York: Oxford University Press

Steward, Julian
1942 The Direct Historical Approach to Archaeology.
American Antiquity 7: 337-343.

Tan Guangrong 覃光荣
1984 Guangxi Zhuangzu Zizhi Chu he Xian Chutu Yipi Zhanguo Tong Qi.
广西壮族自治区贺县出土一批战国铜器
KG 9: 853-54.

Terwiel, B.J.
1978 The Origin of the T'ai Peoples Reconsidered.
Oriens Extremus 25(2): 239-258.

1979 Tai Funeral Customs: Towards a Reconstruction of Archaic-Tai Ceremonies.
Anthropos 74.3/4: 393-432.

Watson, Burton, translator
1968 The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu.
New York: Columbia University Press.

1969 Records of the Historian - Chapters from the Shi Chi of Ssu-ma Ch'ien.
New York: Columbia University Press.

Wenwu Cultural Committee, ed.
文物编辑委员会

1979 Wenwu Kaogu Gongzuo Sanshi Nian.
文物考古工作三十年
Beijing: Wenwu Press.

Wenwu Press
1959 Yunnan Jinning Shizhai Shan Gu Mu jun Fajue Baogao.
云南晋宁石寨山出土古墓群发掘报告
Beijing: Wenwu Press. 2 vols.

Wu Mingsheng 吴铭生
1982 Zixing Jiushi Zhanguo Mu Fanying di Chu, Yue Wenhua Guanxi Tantao.
资兴旧市战国墓反映的楚越文化关系探讨
Hunan Kaogu Jikan l: 105-110.

1983a Hunan Zixing Jiushi Zhanguo Mu.
湖南资兴旧市战国墓
KGXB 1: 93-124.

1983b Cong Kaogu Faxian Tan Hunan Gu Yuezu di Gaimao.
从考古发现谈湖南古越族的概貌
JHKG 9: 52-57.

Yang Hao 杨豪
1961 Jieshao Guangdong Jinnian Faxian di Jijian Qingtong Qi.
介绍广东今年发现的几件青铜器
KG ll: 599-600.

Yang Yaolin and Xu Huanbin 杨耀林 徐恒彬
1985 Zhuhai Gongbei Xin Shiqui yu Qingtongqi Yizhi di Diaocha yu Shijue.
珠海拱北新石器与青铜器遗址的调查与试掘
KG 8: 686-689.

Zhang Chao 张潮
1984 Gu Yue Wenhua Chutan.
古越文化初探
JHKG 4: 80-83.

Zhang Zeng Qi 张增祺
1982 "Bai Yue" di Chudi Xin Shiqi Shidai Wenhua. 百越的出地新石器时代文化
In Bai Yue Minzu Shi Lun Ji. Pp. 29-46. 百越民族试论
Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Shehui Press.

Previous Issues

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
1	Nov. 1986	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	The Need for an Alphabetically Arranged General Usage Dictionary of Mandarin Chinese: A Review Article of Some Recent Dictionaries and Current Lexicographical Projects	31
2	Dec. 1986	Andrew Jones *Hiroshima*	The Poetics of Uncertainty in Early Chinese Literature	45
3	March 1987	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	A Partial Bibliography for the Study of Indian Influence on Chinese Popular Literature	iv, 214
4	Nov. 1987	Robert M. Sanders *University of Hawaii*	The Four Languages of "Mandarin"	14
5	Dec. 1987	Eric A. Havelock *Vassar College*	Chinese Characters and the Greek Alphabet	4
6	Jan. 1988	J. Marshall Unger *University of Hawaii*	Computers and Japanese Literacy: Nihonzin no Yomikaki Nôryoku to Konpyuta	13
7	Jan. 1988	Chang Tsung-tung *Goethe-Universität*	Indo-European Vocabulary in Old Chinese	i, 56
8	Feb. 1988	various	Reviews (I)	ii, 39
9	Dec. 1988	Soho Machida *Daitoku-ji, Kyoto*	Life and Light, the Infinite: A Historical and Philological Analysis of the Amida Cult	46
10	June 1989	Pratoom Angurarohita *Chulalongkorn University Bangkok*	Buddhist Influence on the Neo-Confucian Concept of the Sage	31
11	July 1989	Edward Shaughnessy *University of Chicago*	Western Cultural Innovations in China, 1200 BC	8

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
12	Aug. 1989	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	The Contributions of T'ang and Five Dynasties Transformation Texts (*pien-wen*) to Later Chinese Popular Literature	71
13	Oct. 1989	Jiaosheng Wang *Shanghai*	The Complete *Ci*-Poems of Li Qingzhao: A New English Translation	xii, 122
14	Dec. 1989	various	Reviews (II)	69
15	Jan. 1990	George Cardona *University of Pennsylvania*	On Attitudes Toward Language in Ancient India	19
16	March 1990	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Three Brief Essays Concerning Chinese Tocharistan	16
17	April 1990	Heather Peters *University Museum of Philadelphia*	Tattooed Faces and Stilt Houses: Who Were the Ancient Yue?	28
18	May 1990	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Two Non-Tetragraphic Northern Sinitic Languages a. Implications of the Soviet Dungan Script for Chinese Language Reform b. Who Were the Gyámi?	28
19	June 1990	*Bosat Man Nalanda*	Backhill/Peking/Beijing	6
20	Oct. 1990	*Victor H. Mair University of Pennsylvania*	Introduction and Notes for a Translation of the Ma-wang-tui MSS of the *Lao Tzu*	68

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
21	Dec. 1990	Philippa Jane Benson *Carnegie Mellon University*	Two Cross-Cultural Studies on Reading Theory	9, 13
22	March 1991	David Moser *University of Michigan*	Slips of the Tongue and Pen in Chinese	45
23	April 1991	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Tracks of the Tao, Semantics of Zen	10
24	Aug. 1991	David A. Utz *University of Pennsylvania*	Language, Writing, and Tradition in Iran	24
25	Aug. 1991	Jean DeBernardi *University of Alberta*	Linguistic Nationalism: The Case of Southern Min	22 + 3 figs.
26	Sept. 1991	JAO Tsung-i *Chinese University of Hong Kong*	Questions on the Origins of Writing Raised by the Silk Road	10
27	Aug. 1991	Victor H. Mair, ed. *University of Pennsylvania*	*Schriftfestschrift: Essays in Honor of John DeFrancis on His Eightieth Birthday*	ix, 245
28	Sept. 1991	ZHOU Youguang *State Language Commission, Peking*	The Family of Chinese Character-Type Scripts (*Twenty Members and Four Stages of Development*)	11
29	Sept. 1991	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	What Is a Chinese "Dialect/Topolect"? Reflections on Some Key Sino-English Linguistic Terms	31
30	Oct. 1991	M. V. Sofronov *Institute of Far Eastern Studies, Academy of Sciences, Moscow*	Chinese Philology and the Scripts of Central Asia	10
31	Oct. 1991	various	Reviews (III)	68

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
32	Aug. 1992	David McCraw *University of Hawaii*	How the Chinawoman Lost Her Voice	27
33	Sept. 1992	FENG Lide and Kevin Stuart *Chuankou No. 1 Middle School and Qinghai Education College*	Interethnic Contact on the Inner Asian Frontier: The Gangou People of Minhe County, Qinghai	34
34	Oct. 1992	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Two Papers on Sinolinguistics 1. A Hypothesis Concerning the Origin of the Term *fanqie* ("Countertomy") 2. East Asian Round-Trip Words	13
35	Nov. 1992	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania* with an added note by Edwin G. Pulleyblank	Reviews (IV)	37
36	Feb. 1993	XU Wenkan *Hanyu Da Cidian editorial offices, Shanghai*	Hanyu Wailaici de Yuyuan Kaozheng he Cidian Bianzuan (Philological Research on the Etymology of Loanwords in Sinitic and Dictionary Compilation)	13
37	March 1993	Tanya Storch *University of New Mexico*	Chinese Buddhist Historiography and Orality	16
38	April 1993	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	The Linguistic and Textual Antecedents of *The Sutra of the Wise and the Foolish*	95

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
39	Aug. 1993	Jordan Paper *York University*	A Material Case for a Late Bering Strait Crossing Coincident with Pre-Columbian Trans-Pacific Crossings	17
40	Sept. 1993	Michael Carr *Center for Language Studies, Otaru University of Commerce*	*Tiao*-Fish through Chinese Dictionaries	68
41	Oct. 1993	Paul Goldin *Harvard University*	Miching Mallecho: The *Zhanguo ce* and Classical Rhetoric	27
42	Nov. 1993	Renchin-Jashe Yulshul *Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Kokonor (Qinghai)* and Kevin Stuart *Institute of Foreign Languages, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia*	Kham Tibetan Language Materials	39
43	Dec. 1993	MA Quanlin, MA Wanxiang, and MA Zhicheng *Xining* Edited by Kevin Stuart *Kokonor*	Salar Language Materials	72
44	Jan. 1994	Dolkun Kamberi *Columbia University*	The Three Thousand Year Old Charchan Man Preserved at Zaghunluq	15
45	May 1994	Mark Hansell *Carleton College*	The Sino-Alphabet: The Assimilation of Roman Letters into the Chinese Writing System	28
46	July 1994	various	Reviews (V)	2, 155

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
47	Aug. 1994	Robert S. Bauer *Mahidol University Salaya Nakornpathom, Thailand*	Sino-Tibetan *kolo "Wheel"	11
48	Sept. 1994	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Introduction and Notes for a Complete Translation of the *Chuang Tzu*	xxxiv, 110
49	Oct. 1994	Ludo Rocher *University of Pennsylvania*	Orality and Textuality in the Indian Context	28
50	Nov. 1994	YIN Binyong *State Language Commission and Institute for Applied Linguistics (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences)*	Diyi ge Lading Zimu de Hanyu Pinyin Fang'an Shi Zenyang Chansheng de? [How Was the First Romanized Spelling System for Sinitic Produced?]	7
51	Nov. 1994	HAN Kangxin *Institute of Archeology Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	The Study of Ancient Human Skeletons from Xinjiang, China	9 + 4 figs.
52	Nov. 1994	Warren A. Shibles *University of Wisconsin Whitewater*	Chinese Romanization Systems: IPA Transliteration	20
53	Nov. 1994	XU Wenkan *Editorial Offices of the Hanyu Da Cidian Shanghai*	Guanyu Tuhuoluoren de Qiyuan he Qianxi Wenti [On the Problem of the Origins and Migrations of the Tocharians]	11
54	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Jegün Yogur	34
55	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Dongxiang	34

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
56	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Dagur	36
57	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Monguor	31
58	Nov. 1994	Üjiyediin Chuluu (Chaolu Wu) *University of Toronto*	Introduction, Grammar, and Sample Sentences for Baoan	28
59	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart *Qinghai Junior Teachers College;* Limusishiden *Qinghai Medical College Attached Hospital, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)*	China's Monguor Minority: Ethnography and Folktales	i, I, 193
60	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart, Li Xuewei, and Shelear *Qinghai Junior Teachers College, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)*	China's Dagur Minority: Society, Shamanism, and Folklore	vii, 167
61	Dec. 1994	Kevin Stuart and Li Xuewei *Qinghai Junior Teachers College, Xining, Kokonor (Qinghai)*	Tales from China's Forest Hunters: Oroqen Folktales	iv, 59
62	Dec. 1994	William C. Hannas *Georgetown University*	Reflections on the "Unity" of Spoken and Written Chinese and Academic Learning in China	5
63	Dec. 1994	Sarah M. Nelson *University of Denver*	The Development of Complexity in Prehistoric North China	17
64	Jan. 1995	Arne Østmoe *Bangkok, Thailand, and Drøbak, Norway*	A Germanic-Tai Linguistic Puzzle	81, 6

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
65	Feb. 1995	Penglin Wang *Chinese University of Hong Kong*	Indo-European Loanwords in Altaic	28
66	March 1995	ZHU Qingzhi *Sichuan University and Peking University*	Some Linguistic Evidence for Early Cultural Exchange Between China and India	7
67	April 1995	David McCraw *University of Hawaii*	Pursuing Zhuangzi as a Rhymemaster: A Snark-Hunt in Eight Fits	38
68	May 1995	Ke Peng, Yanshi Zhu *University of Chicago and Tokyo, Japan*	New Research on the Origin of Cowries Used in Ancient China	i, 26
69	Jan. 1996	Dpal-ldan-bkra-shis, Keith Slater, *et al.* *Qinghai, Santa Barbara, etc.*	Language Materials of China's Monguor Minority: Huzhu Mongghul and Minhe Mangghuer	xi, 266
70	Feb. 1996	David Utz, Xinru Liu, *Taylor Carman, Bryan Van Norden, and the Editor* *Philadelphia, Vassar, etc.*	Reviews VI	93
71	March 1996	Erik Zürcher *Leiden University* Seishi Karashima *Soka University* Huanming Qin *Tang Studies Hotline*	Vernacularisms in Medieval Chinese Texts	31 + 11 + 8
72	May 1996	E. Bruce Brooks *University of Massachusetts*	The Life and Mentorship of Confucius	44
73	June 1996	ZHANG Juan, et al., and Kevin Stuart *Qinghai, Inner Mongolia, Shanxi, Henan, Liaoning*	Blue Cloth and Pearl Deer; Yogur Folklore	iii, 76

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
74	Jan. 1997	David Moser *University of Michigan & Beijing Foreign Studies University*	Covert Sexism in Mandarin Chinese	23
75	Feb. 1997	Haun Saussy *Stanford University*	The Prestige of Writing: Wen^2, Letter, Picture, Image, Ideography	40
76	Feb. 1997	Patricia Eichenbaum Karetzky *Bard College*	The Evolution of the Symbolism of the Paradise of the Buddha of Infinite Life and Its Western Origins	28
77	Jan. 1998	Daniel Hsieh *Purdue University*	The Origin and Nature of the "Nineteen Old Poems"	49
78	Feb. 1998	Narsu *Inner Mongolia College of Agriculture & Animal Husbandry* Kevin Stuart *Qinghai Junior Teachers' College*	Practical Mongolian Sentences (With English Translation)	iii + 49 + ii + 66
79	March 1998	Dennis Grafflin *Bates College*	A Southeast Asian Voice in the Daodejing?	8
80	July 1998	Taishan Yu *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A Study of Saka History	ii + 225
81	Sept. 1998	Hera S. Walker *Ursinus College (Philadelphia)*	Indigenous or Foreign?: A Look at the Origins of the Monkey Hero Sun Wukong	iv + 110
82	Sept. 1998	I. S. Gurevich *Russian Academy of Sciences*	A Fragment of a pien-wen(?) Related to the Cycle "On Buddha's Life"	15
83	Oct. 1998	Minglang Zhou *University of Colorado at Boulder*	Tense/Aspect markers in Mandarin and Xiang dialects, and their contact	20

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
84	Oct. 1998	Ulf Jäger *Gronau/Westfalen, Germany*	The New Old Mummies from Eastern Central Asia: Ancestors of the Tocharian Knights Depicted on the Buddhist Wallpaintings of Kucha and Turfan? Some Circumstantial Evidence	9
85	Oct. 1998	Mariko Namba Walter *University of New England*	Tokharian Buddhism in Kucha: Buddhism of Indo-European Centum Speakers in Chinese Turkestan before the 10th Century C.E.	30
86	Oct. 1998	Jidong Yang *University of Pennsylvania*	Siba: Bronze Age Culture of the Gansu Corridor	18
87	Nov. 1998	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Canine Conundrums: Eurasian Dog Ancestor Myths in Historical and Ethnic Perspective	74
88	Dec. 1998	Saroj Kumar Chaudhuri *Aichi Gakusen University*	Siddham in China and Japan	9, 124
89	Jan. 1999	Alvin Lin *Yale University*	Writing Taiwanese: The Development of Modern Written Taiwanese	4 + 41 + 4
90	Jan. 1999	Victor H. Mair et al	Reviews VII [including review of The Original Analects]	2, 38
91	Jan. 1999	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Phonosymbolism or Etymology: The Case of the Verb “Cop”	28
92	Jan. 1999	Christine Louise Lin *Dartmouth College*	The Presbyterian Church in Taiwan and the Advocacy of Local Autonomy	xiii + 136

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
93	Jan. 1999	David S. Nivison *Stanford University*	The Key to the Chronology of the Three Dynasties: The "Modern Text" Bamboo Annals	iv + 68
94	March 1999	Julie Lee Wei *Hoover Institute*	Correspondence Between the Chinese Calendar Signs and the Phoenician Alphabet	65 + 6
95	May 1999	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	A Medieval, Central Asian Buddhist Theme in a Late Ming Taoist Tale by Feng Meng-lung	27
96	June 1999	E. Bruce Brooks *University of Massachusetts*	Alexandrian Motifs in Chinese Texts	14
97	Dec. 1999	LI Shuicheng *Peking University*	Sino-Western Contact in the Second Millennium BC	iv, 29
98	Jan. 2000	Peter Daniels, Daniel Boucher, and other authors	Reviews VIII	108
99	Feb. 2000	Anthony Barbieri-Low *Princeton University*	Wheeled Vehicles in the Chinese Bronze Age (c. 2000-741 BC)	v, 98 + 5 color plates
100	Feb. 2000	Wayne Alt *Community College of Baltimore County (Essex)*	Zhuangzi, Mysticism, and the Rejection of Distinctions	29
101	March 2000	C. Michele Thompson *South Connecticut State University*	The Viêt Peoples and the Origins of Nom	71, 1
102	March 2000	Theresa Jen *Bryn Mawr College* Ping Xu *Baruch College*	Penless Chinese Character Reproduction	15

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
103	June 2000	Carrie E. Reid *Middlebury College*	Early Chinese Tattoo	52
104	July 2000	David W. Pankenier *Lehigh University*	Popular Astrology and Border Affairs in Early China	19 + 1 color plate
105	Aug. 2000	Anne Birrell *Cambridge University*	Postmodernist Theory in Recent Studies of Chinese Literature	31
106	Sept. 2000	Yu Taishan *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A Hypothesis about the Sources of the Sai Tribes	i, 3, 200
107	Sept. 2000	Jacques deLisle, Adelheid E. Krohne, and the editor	Reviews IX	148 + map
108	Sept. 2000	Ruth H. Chang *University of Pennsylvania*	Understanding *Di* and *Tian*: Deity and Heaven From Shang to Tang	vii, 54
109	Oct. 2000	Conán Dean Carey *Stanford University*	In Hell the One without Sin is Lord	ii, 60
110	Oct. 2000	Toh Hoong Teik *Harvard University*	Shaykh 'Alam: The Emperor of Early Sixteenth-Century China	20
111	Nov. 2000	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	The Need for a New Era	10
112	July 2001	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Notes on the Anau Inscription	xi, 93
113	Aug. 2001	Ray Collins *Chepachet, RI* David Kerr *Melbourne, FL*	Etymology of the Word "Macrobiotic:s" and Its Use in Modern Chinese Scholarship	18

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
114	March 2002	Ramnath Subbaraman *University of Chicago*	Beyond the Question of the Monkey Imposter: Indian Influence on the Chinese Novel, *The Journey to the West*	35
115	April 2002	ZHOU Jixu *Sichuan Normal University*	Correspondences of Basic Words Between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European	8
116	May 2002	LIU Yongquan *Institute of Linguistics, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	On the Problem of Chinese Lettered Words	13
117	May 2002	SHANG Wei *Columbia University*	*Baihua, Guanhua, Fangyan* and the May Fourth Reading of *Rulin Waishi*	10
118	June 2002	Justine T. Snow *Port Townsend, WA*	Evidence for the Indo-European Origin of Two Ancient Chinese Deities	ii, 75, 1 color, 1 b-w print
119	July 2002	WU Zhen *Xinjiang Museum, Ürümchi*	"Hu" Non-Chinese as They Appear in the Materials from the Astana Graveyard at Turfan	21, 5 figs.
120	July 2002	Anne Birrell *University of Cambridge, Clare Hall*	Female-Gendered Myth in the *Classic of Mountains and Seas*	47
121	July 2002	Mark Edward Lewis *Stanford University*	Dicing and Divination in Early China	22, 7 figs.
122	July 2002	Julie Wilensky *Yale Univesity*	The Magical *Kunlun* and "Devil Slaves": Chinese Perceptions of Dark-skinned People and Africa before 1500	51, 3 figs.
123	Aug. 2002	Paul R. Goldin and the editor	Reviews X	30

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
124	August 2002	Fredrik T. Hiebert *University of Pennsylvania* John Colarusso *McMaster University*	The Context of the Anau Seal Remarks on the Anau and Niyä Seals	1-34 35-47
125	July 2003	ZHOU Jixu *Sichuan Normal University* *Shanghai Normal University*	Correspondences of Cultural Words between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European	19
126	Aug. 2003	Tim Miller *University of Washington*	A Southern Min Word in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*	14
127	Oct. 2003	Sundeep S. Jhutti *Petaluma, California*	The Getes	125, 8 color plates
128	Nov. 2003	Yinpo Tschang *New York City*	On Proto-Shang	18
129	Dec. 2003	Michael Witzel *Harvard University*	Linguistic Evidence for Cultural Exchange in Prehistoric Western Central Asia	70
130	Feb. 2004	Bede Fahey *Fort St. John, British Columbia*	Mayan: A Sino-Tibetan Language? A Comparative Study	61
131	March 2004	Taishan Yu *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A History of the Relationship between the Western and Eastern Han, Wei, Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties and the Western Regions	1, 3, 352
132	April 2004	Kim Hayes *Sydney*	On the Presence of Non-Chinese at Anyang	11

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
133	April 2004	John L. Sorenson *Brigham Young University* Carl L. Johannessen *University of Oregon*	*Scientific Evidence for Pre-Columbian Transoceanic Voyages* CD-ROM	48, 166, 19, 15 plates
134	May 2004	Xieyan Hincha *Neumädewitz, Germany*	Two Steps Toward Digraphia in China	i, 22
135	May 2004	John J. Emerson *Portland, Oregon*	*The Secret History of the Mongols* and Western Literature	21
136	May 2004	Serge Papillon *Mouvaux, France and Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia*	Influences tokhariennes sur la mythologie chinoise	47
137	June 2004	Hoong Teik Toh *Harvard University*	Some Classical Malay Materials for the Study of the Chinese Novel *Journey to the West*	64
138	June 2004	Julie Lee Wei *San Jose and London*	Dogs and Cats: Lessons from Learning Chinese	17
139	June 2004	Taishan Yu *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A Hypothesis on the Origin of the Yu State	20
140	June 2004	Yinpo Tschang *New York City*	Shih and Zong: Social Organization in Bronze Age China	28
141	July 2004	Yinpo Tschang *New York City*	Chaos in Heaven: On the Calendars of Preclassical China	30
142	July 2004	Katheryn Linduff, ed. *University of Pittsburgh*	*Silk Road Exchange in China*	64
143	July 2004	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Sleep in *Dream*: Soporific Responses to Depression in *Story of the Stone*	99

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
144	July 2004	RONG Xinjiang *Peking University*	Land Route or Sea Route? Commentary on the Study of the Paths of Transmission and Areas in which Buddhism Was Disseminated during the Han Period	32
145	Aug. 2004	the editor	Reviews XI	2, 41
146	Feb. 2005	Hoong Teik Toh *Academia Sinica*	The *-yu* Ending in Xiongnu, Xianbei, and Gaoju Onomastica	24
147	March 2005	Hoong Teik Toh *Academia Sinica*	Ch. *Qiong* ~ Tib. Khyung; Taoism ~ Bonpo -- Some Questions Related to Early Ethno-Religious History in Sichuan	18
148	April 2005	Lucas Christopoulos *Beijing Sports University*	Le gréco-bouddhisme et l'art du poing en Chine	52
149	May 2005	Kimberly S. Te Winkle *University College, London*	A Sacred Trinity: God, Mountain, and Bird: Cultic Practices of the Bronze Age Chengdu Plain	ii, 103 (41 in color)
150	May 2005	Dolkun Kamberi *Washington, DC*	Uyghurs and Uyghur Identity	44
151	June 2005	Jane Jia SI *University of Pennsylvania*	The Genealogy of Dictionaries: Producers, Literary Audience, and the Circulation of English Texts in the Treaty Port of Shanghai	44, 4 tables
152	June 2005	Denis Mair *Seattle*	The Dance of Qian and Kun in the *Zhouyi*	13, 2 figs.
153	July 2005	Alan Piper *London (UK)*	The Mysterious Origins of the Word "Marihuana"	17

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
154	July 2005	Serge Papillon *Belfort, France*	*Mythologie sino-européenne*	174, 1 plate
155	July 2005	Denis Mair *Seattle*	Janus-Like Concepts in the *Li* and *Kun* Trigrams	8
156	July 2005	Abolqasem Esmailpour *Shahid Beheshti University, Tehran*	*Manichean Gnosis and Creation*	157
157	Aug. 2005	Ralph D. Sawyer *Independent Scholar*	Paradoxical Coexistence of Prognostication and Warfare	13
158	Aug. 2005	Mark Edward Lewis *Stanford University*	Writings on Warfare Found in Ancient Chinese Tombs	15
159	Aug. 2005	Jens Østergaard Petersen *University of Copenhagen*	The *Zuozhuan* Account of the Death of King Zhao of Chu and Its Sources	47
160	Sept. 2005	Matteo Compareti *Venice*	Literary Evidence for the Identification of Some Common Scenes in Han Funerary Art	14
161	Sept. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	The Names of the *Yi Jing* Trigrams: An Inquiry into Their Linguistic Origins	18
162	Sept. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	Counting and Knotting: Correspondences between Old Chinese and Indo-European	71, map
163	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	Huangdi and Huntun (the Yellow Emperor and Wonton): A New Hypothesis on Some Figures in Chinese Mythology	44
164	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	Shang and Zhou: An Inquiry into the Linguistic Origins of Two Dynastic Names	62

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
165	Oct. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London*	DAO and DE: An Inquiry into the Linguistic Origins of Some Terms in Chinese Philosophy and Morality	51
166	Nov. 2005	Julie Lee Wei *London* Hodong Kim *Seoul National University* and David Selvia and the Editor *both of the University of Pennsylvania*	Reviews XII	i, 63
167	Dec. 2005	ZHOU Jixu *Sichuan Normal University*	Old Chinese '帝*tees' and Proto-Indo-European "*deus": Similarity in Religious Ideas and a Common Source in Linguistics	17
168	Dec. 2005	Judith A. Lerner *New York City*	Aspects of Assimilation: the Funerary Practices and Furnishings of Central Asians in China	51, v, 9 plates
169	Jan. 2006	Victor H. Mair *University of Pennsylvania*	Conversion Tables for the Three-Volume Edition of the *Hanyu Da Cidian*	i, 284
170	Feb. 2006	Amber R. Woodward *University of Pennsylvania*	Learning English, Losing Face, and Taking Over: The Method (or Madness) of Li Yang and His Crazy English	18

Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* will be published electronically on the Web. Issues from no. 1 to no. 170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web. For prices of paper copies, see the catalog at www.sino-platonic.org

171	June 2006	John DeFrancis *University of Hawaii*	The Prospects for Chinese Writing Reform	26, 3 figs.
172	Aug. 2006	Deborah Beaser	The Outlook for Taiwanese Language Preservation	18

Previous Issues, *cont.*

Number	Date	Author	Title	Pages
173	Oct. 2006	Taishan Yu *Chinese Academy of Social Sciences*	A Study of the History of the Relationship Between the Western and Eastern Han, Wei, Jin, Northern and Southern Dynasties and the Western Regions	167
174	Nov. 2006	Mariko Namba Walter	Sogdians and Buddhism	65
175	Dec. 2006	Zhou Jixu *Center for East Asian Studies, University of Pennsylvania; Chinese Department, Sichuan Normal University*	The Rise of Agricultural Civilization in China: The Disparity between Archeological Discovery and the Documentary Record and Its Explanation	38
176	May 2007	Eric Henry *University of North Carolina*	The Submerged History of Yuè	36
177	Aug. 2007	Beverley Davis *Merit, Texas*	Timeline of the Development of the Horse	186
179	Feb. 2008	Julie M. Groves *Hong Kong Baptist University*	Language or Dialect — or Topolect? A Comparison of the Attitudes of Hong Kongers and Mainland Chinese towards the Status of Cantonese	103